

Remarks

Claims 1-9 are pending. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9.

Claim 3 is objected to for informalities, but Applicant is unsure how to amend the claim to correct the informalities. The office action states, "the claim recites relay optics in a specific relationship with a reflective element, but specification seems to describe a field lens 24 as that optical component with has a relationship with element 26 which is not a reflective element." The confusion lies in that the reference in the claim is not to either the field lens 24 or the element 26.

As stated in the specification, in the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 28, "In this embodiment, when a relay lens pair is desired to be used, two lens elements will be required. One element is required in path 22 and one in path 23." Referring to Figure 1, it can be seen that the relay lens would be in path 22 between the polarizing beam splitter 14 and the reflective element 20. It is therefore submitted that the specification as filed included the appropriate support for this claim, and that this claim and the relationship of the optics is not in error.

With regard to the comment about a relay lens being detrimental. Relay lenses are not required in the embodiments of the invention as claimed, which may be advantageous. However, as stated on page 6, lines 5-12, they can be used if desired. The reference in the background merely stated that relay lenses increase the cost of the system.

Claims 1, 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradley (US Patent No. 5,845,981) and Bradley (US Patent No. 5,892,623).

The reflective elements MR10, et al, are stationary reflective elements. None of these elements spin. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly point out that the reflective element of the invention as claimed spins to form the scrolling raster lines of illumination. Bradley mentions a scanning prism, which is not a reflective element. Therefore, Bradley

does not show, teach nor suggest the invention as claimed in claim 1, 6, 8 and 9. It is therefore submitted these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradley (the combination of the two patents) in view of Stahl et al. (US Patent No. 6,661,475).

The combination of references does not teach the illumination optics of either claim 2 or of claim 4 in conjunction with a spinning, reflective element. The reflective elements of Stahl do not move, either. It is therefore submitted that claims 2 and 4 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradley (the combination of the two patents) in view of Gauthier et al. (US Patent No. 4,938,596).

The combination of references does not show, teach or suggest any optics being combined with a spinning, reflective element. The reflective elements in Gauthier do not move, either. It is therefore submitted that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradley (the combination of the two patents) in view of DeVaan (US Patent No. 6,018,214).

The combination of references does not show, teach nor suggest the combination of arrays of individually elements of any type with a spinning, reflective element. The reflective elements of DeVaan do not rotate or spin. It is therefore submitted that claims 5 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Prior art made of record but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613